

STATE OF ILLINOIS
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY)	
)	
Petition for declaration of service currently)	
provided under Rate 6L to 3 MW and greater)	Docket No. 02-0479
customers as a competitive service pursuant)	
to Section 16-113 of the Public Utilities Act)	
and approval of related tariff amendments)	

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

MATTHEW I. KAHAL

ON BEHALF OF THE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

JANUARY 24, 2003

EXETER
ASSOCIATES, INC.
12510 Prosperity Drive
Suite 350
Silver Spring, Maryland 20904

STATE OF ILLINOIS

ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY)	
)	
Petition for declaration of service currently)	
provided under Rate 6L to 3 MW and greater)	
customers as a competitive service pursuant)	Docket No. 02-0479
to Section 16-113 of the Public Utilities Act)	
and approval of related tariff amendments)	

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

MATTHEW I. KAHAL

I. QUALIFICATIONS

1 Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS?

2 A. My name is Matthew I. Kahal. I am an independent consultant retained by Exeter
3 Associates, Inc., a consulting firm under contract with the U.S. Department of Energy.
4 My business address is 12510 Prosperity Drive, Silver Spring, Maryland 20904.

5 Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND.

6 A. I hold a B.A. and a M.A. degree in economics from the University of Maryland and have
7 completed all course work and examination requirements for the Ph.D. in economics
8 from the same institution.

9 Q. WHAT IS YOUR PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND?

10 A. I have been employed in the area of energy, utility and telecommunications consulting on
11 a continuous basis since 1977. From 1981 to 2001, I was a senior economist and
12 Principal with Exeter Associates, Inc, a firm that I co-founded. Most of my professional
13 work over the years has focused on utility planning, power plant licensing, environmental

1 compliance, purchase power contracting, acquisition, and a range of ratemaking issues.
2 In recent years, much of my professional work has shifted to mergers, market design, and
3 restructuring issues.

4 Since leaving Exeter as an employee in 2001, I have been providing consulting
5 assistance to the U.S. Department of Justice, the Maryland Department of Natural
6 Resources and the Energy Administration, the Connecticut Attorney General, the
7 Pennsylvania Officer of Consumer Advocate, the U.S. Air Force and state utility
8 commissions (or their Staffs) in Arkansas, Louisiana and Rhode Island.

9 Prior to entering consulting, I served on the faculties at the University of
10 Maryland (College Park) and Montgomery College, teaching undergraduate economics
11 and business courses. Attachment A accompanying my rebuttal testimony, provides a
12 more detailed Statement of Qualifications.

13 Q HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED AS AN EXPERT WITNESS?

14 A. Yes. I have testified before approximately two dozen state, and federal regulatory
15 commissions in more than 200 separate cases. My testimony in those cases addressed a
16 wide range of topics including rate of return, need for power, rate design, resource
17 planning, mergers, stranded costs, purchase power contracts and various other ratemaking
18 and policy issues. I have also testified before the U.S. Congress, Committee on Ways
19 and Means, on federal tax legislation affecting utilities. These cases are listed
20 Attachment A.

21 Q. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED BEFORE THIS COMMISSION?

22 A. Yes, I have testified in several past cases involving Commonwealth Edison Company
23 (ComEd) and Illinois Power Company. Those cases are listed in Attachment A.

1 Q. ONE OF THE ISSUES RAISED IN THIS DOCKET CONCERNS THE FORM AND
2 AVAILABILITY OF PROVIDER OF LAST RESORT SERVICE (POLR). DO
3 YOU HAVE ANY EXPERIENCE ADDRESSING THAT ISSUE?

4 A. Yes. I have been involved in numerous electric restructuring proceedings and settlements
5 during the past five years, and the terms and conditions of POLR service have typically
6 risen as a significant issue in those cases. During the past year, I have participated in a
7 settlement process to develop a post-transition POLR service for Maryland consumers,
8 culminating in a widely-supported settlement filed with the Maryland Public Service
9 Commission on November 15, 2002. I participated in that process on behalf of the
10 Maryland State Agencies, representing both the State's broad policy interests and the
11 Agencies' narrower interests as electric customers.

12 13 **II. BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY**

14 Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS PROCEEDING?

15 A. This proceeding was initiated in July 2002 by a Petition submitted by ComEd to declare
16 Rate 6L (Large General Service) to be a competitive service for retail customers with
17 loads of 3 MW or greater. Under the Company's proposal, the bundled 6L rate would no
18 longer be available for any such customer either leaving Rate 6L after June 2003 or not
19 taking service under Rate 6L as of that date. A number of parties objected to this
20 competitive declaration, including parties representing customers potentially impacted by
21 this change.

22 On November 14, 2002, the Commission issued an Interim Order that had the
23 effect of granting the Petition even though the Order did not agree entirely with the
24 Company's position. (See Ordering paragraph 5.) As part of this case, ComEd also
25 proposed modifications to its hourly service rate, Rate HEP, and the Interim Order did

1 not rule on those changes. Instead, the Order directed the Company to make a tariff filing
2 with those changes to be adjudicated in a subsequent phase of this docket. (See Ordering
3 paragraph 11.) On November 25, 2002, the Company filed the revised Rate HEP tariff in
4 compliance with the Interim Order.

5 Q. DID COMED FILE SUPPORTING TESTIMONY?

6 A. Yes. Testimony supporting the proposed changes to Rate HEP was submitted by ComEd
7 witness Alongi last July. No additional testimony was filed on November 25.

8 Q. ON WHOSE BEHALF ARE YOU TESTIFYING IN THIS PROCEEDING?

9 A. I am testifying on behalf of the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). DOE operates two
10 major research facilities in the ComEd service territory, Argonne National Laboratory
11 and the Fermi National Accelerator Center. In addition, the federal government operates
12 several other major facilities that are customers of ComEd.

13 Q. DID DOE PARTICIPATE IN LAST YEAR'S PHASE OF THIS CASE?

14 A. Yes. Last year DOE sponsored the Direct Testimony of Dr. Dale Swan. That testimony
15 contested the Company's Petition concluding that in comparison to Rate 6L "there is no
16 reasonably equivalent service currently available at a comparable price." (Direct
17 Testimony, page 3) Dr. Swan attributed the lack of comparability at least in part to the
18 inherent unpredictability of the CTC determinations. He further concluded that the large
19 customer switching data tends to overstate the true robustness of the retail competitive
20 market because that market has been artificially propped up by Exelon's Market
21 Development Program.

22 Q. WHY ARE THE RATE 6L UNAVAILABILITY AND RATE HEP
23 PROBLEMATIC FOR DOE?

24 A. The Commission's Interim Order will have the effect of restricting the availability to
25 large industrial customers (such as Fermi and Argonne) of an important stable price

1 option, i.e., Rate 6L. As Dr. Swan explained, DOE's experience has been that a
2 comparable stable price option cannot be obtained from the retail market. A potentially
3 reasonable alternative would be ComEd's Purchase Power Option (PPO), but this service
4 offering also will not be available on a prospective basis if the CTC determination falls to
5 zero for DOE facilities. As mentioned above, the CTC is inherently unpredictable.

6 If the customer is no longer eligible for Rate 6L (i.e., is not "grandfathered") and
7 if the PPO is no longer available, Rate HEP effectively becomes the only Provider of Last
8 Resort (POLR) service available to these customers. It is my understanding that up to
9 now there has been very little customer interest in this service offering, undoubtedly due
10 in large part to its inherent price volatility and unpredictability. This lack of interest is
11 consistent with experience with similar price offerings in other states. Moreover, an
12 hourly pricing tariff tends to be particularly unsuitable for governmental customers that
13 are subject to an annual budgeting process.

14 Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR TESTIMONY FOR THIS PHASE OF THE
15 PROCEEDING?

16 A. My testimony recognizes that if Rider PPO is no longer available, Rate HEP could
17 become the only POLR service for many customers of 3 MW or greater. I discuss the
18 modifications for that tariff proposed by the Company, and I conclude that the present
19 Monthly Access Charge in that tariff should be modified or eliminated. I also observe
20 that Rate HEP is not a satisfactory POLR service for those large industrial customers
21 unable to obtain acceptable service from competitive retail suppliers. I therefore
22 recommend an alternative approach to providing a stable price POLR.

1 **III. POLR SERVICE ISSUES**

2 **A. The Rate Tariff HEP Changes**

3 Q. WHAT CHANGES TO THE RATE HEP TARIFF HAS COMED PROPOSED?

4 A. According to Mr. Alongi, the Company is proposing the following changes to the Rate
5 HEP tariff:
6

7 (1) There will be a “floor price” on the Monthly Access Charge component of the tariff
8 to ensure that the per unit rate is not less than the sum of the charges that the
9 customer would pay for Distribution, Transmission and Ancillary Services under
10 Rate RCDS and Rider ISS. (Direct Testimony, page 5)
11

12 (2) The current provision that prevents a customer from returning to Rate HEP for 12
13 months after discontinuing service on that rate is eliminated (Id.)
14

15 (3) A customer may leave Rate HEP upon 60-day notice (Id.)
16

17 (4) ComEd is eliminating the requirement that the customer must sign a contract to be
18 served under Rate HEP. (Id.)
19

20 Q. WHAT IS THE STATED PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSED FLOOR ON THE
21 PER UNIT MONTHLY ACCESS CHARGE?

22 A. The Company is concerned that without such a floor rate the Monthly Access Charge
23 could become too inexpensive resulting in an overall cost of electric service below the
24 cost of taking competitive retail supply in combination with ComEd’s delivery service.
25 In other words, ComEd seeks a floor price in order set to prevent harm to the competitive
26 position of retail suppliers.

1 Q. DO YOU AGREE WITH THE NEED FOR THE FLOOR PRICE PROPOSED
2 BY THE COMPANY?

3 A. No, I do not. As a general matter, customers strongly prefer a service that provides some
4 rate stability, and I have seen no evidence that retail suppliers must compete against an
5 hourly, spot-market service. Even without the price floor provision, Rate HEP is simply
6 not a threat to the competitive market.

7 Q. DO YOU AGREE WITH THE ELIMINATION OF THE 12-MONTH RETURN
8 RESTRICTION?

9 A. Yes. This change is a practical necessity given the restrictions on the availability of Rate
10 6L. However, even if Rate 6L is not so restricted, I see no compelling reason for the 12
11 month return limitation.

12 Q. THE LAST TWO CHANGES ELIMINATE THE CONTRACTING
13 REQUIREMENT AND IMPLEMENT A 60-DAY ADVANCE NOTICE
14 REQUIREMENT. ARE THESE CHANGES APPROPRIATE?

15 A. Since Rate HEP will now serve as a short-term default and POLR service, a contracting
16 requirement is clearly inappropriate. I agree with ComEd's proposal to eliminate that
17 requirement.

18 I also agree that a customer must provide reasonable notice to leave that rate
19 schedule for alternative (e.g., competitive) service. However, this notice requirement
20 should be no longer than necessary, and ComEd has not explained why a period as long
21 as 60 days is needed. Mr. Alongi only refers to notification "to allow for adequate
22 planning" (*Id.*), but very little lead-time is needed to "plan" for an hourly service. I
23 would recommend shortening the required lead-time to 30 days, absent compelling
24 evidence that a longer period is needed.

25 Q. WHAT IS YOUR OBJECTION TO THE MONTHLY ACCESS CHARGE?

1 A. The Monthly Access Charge in Rate HEP links the revenues that the customer must pay
2 to the revenues to the customer would pay under Rate 6L (for customers 3MW or
3 greater). This is particularly inappropriate given the fact that the Company is now
4 restricting the availability of Rate 6L. The practical effect of this linkage is that it denies
5 customers the benefit of the mitigation factor (an important consumer benefit under
6 Illinois' restructuring framework). Given the fact that some large customers now may be
7 forced to take service under Rate HEP, it is not reasonable to deny them the benefit of the
8 mitigation factor.

9 Q. WHAT REMEDY DO YOU RECOMMEND?

10 A. There are two potential, conceptually similar remedies. One modification would be to
11 retain the Monthly Access Charge but in calculating its value subtract out the mitigation
12 factor.¹ An acceptable alternative would be to eliminate the Monthly Access Charge and
13 instead require that the Rate HEP customer pay the same delivery service charges
14 (including transmission charges and the CTC) that the customer would pay if it selected
15 competitive retail service.

16 Q. WOULD EITHER RECOMMENDED CHANGE IMPAIR THE COMPETITIVE
17 POSITION OF RETAIL SUPPLIERS?

18 A. No, because the volatility of hourly service makes it inherently unattractive to the vast
19 majority of (if not all) industrial customers even with the favorable changes that I have
20 suggested. I do not foresee customers selecting Rate HEP as an affirmative preference
21 over competitive service. Rather, a customer may find itself on Rate HEP as a POLR
22 service because Rate 6L is not available and the customer is not able to obtain a
23 competitive supply (e.g., a customer with credit or other problems). Alternatively, a
24 customer conceivably could lose its competitive supplier unexpectedly (e.g., due to a

¹ This adjustment assumes there is a non-zero CTC in effect.

1 contract default), and would require Rate HEP service as a temporary stop gap until a
2 new competitive supply is arranged. In neither case is the customer expressing a
3 “preference” for Rate HEP, and therefore is it not reasonable to deny that customer the
4 benefit of the mitigation factor.

5 **B. The Stable Price Option**

6 Q. WITH YOUR RECOMMENDED CHANGES, DOES RATE HEP PROVIDE
7 CUSTOMERS WITH A REASONABLE POLR SERVICE?

8 A. With these modifications, Rate HEP may be acceptable for very short time periods (e.g.,
9 a short hiatus between supply contracts) but the inherent price volatility makes it very
10 unattractive for service over a sustained time period. There are serious questions about
11 the future robustness of the competitive retail market in Illinois as the Commission itself
12 noted in the November 14, 2002 Interim Order (Ordering paragraphs 5 and 6). Some
13 customers may not be able to secure a competitive supply, while others face the dilemma
14 of volatile Rate HEP or incurring cost increases in the retail market.

15 Q. IS THERE AN ALTERNATIVE APPROACH TO PROVIDING POLR?

16 A. Yes. A program for fixed or stable price POLR service should be established and made
17 available for customers not eligible for Rate 6L as a result of the competitive declaration.
18 To provide this service, ComEd would acquire power supply through the competitive
19 wholesale market at a fixed (or at least stable) price and provide generation service to the
20 POLR customers. ComEd would flow through the costs of the competitively procured
21 wholesale power to the POLR customers, along with the Commission-approved delivery
22 service rates and CTCs.

23 Q. WOULD COMED BE EXPOSED TO ANY WHOLESALE POWER MARKET
24 RISK WITH THIS POLR SERVICE?

1 A. No. Using an RFP-type mechanism, ComEd would acquire wholesale power in the form
2 of a requirements contract for some fixed contract term (e.g., a year). The wholesale
3 supplier awarded the contract would bear the market risk and presumably would build
4 that risk into its price bid. ComEd would recover all contract costs in the POLR rates.

5 Q. WHY IS THE POWER SUPPLY OBTAINED FROM THE WHOLESALE
6 MARKET RATHER THAN THE RETAIL MARKET?

7 A. The wholesale power supply market is much better developed and more robust than the
8 very limited retail market in Illinois. As was observed in last year's case, the
9 development of retail competition may be impaired by the reciprocity issue, a problem
10 not present in wholesale markets. Hence, I have far more confidence a competitive
11 supply can be acquired through the use of the wholesale market.

12 Q. WILL COMED'S PROVISION OF A FIXED PRICE POLR, THROUGH A
13 WHOLESALE COMPETITIVE ACQUISITION, IMPAIR THE
14 DEVELOPMENT OF RETAIL COMPETITION?

15 A. If this program is implemented properly, that should not happen. As mentioned above,
16 the wholesale suppliers will include in their price bids premiums related to the market
17 risks that they incur in providing full requirements service. As a result of these risk
18 premiums (and possibly other features), this POLR service will not be inexpensive, and
19 competitive retail suppliers should be able to successfully compete against it.

20 Q. CAN THIS PROGRAM BE IMPLEMENTED BY JUNE 2003?

21 A. No, it cannot. I have only outlined the concept and there are many design features to be
22 developed and issues to be resolved before the competitive acquisition can proceed. A
23 partial list of issues would include:

24
25 ↪ protocols and parameters for how ComEd would acquire the wholesale supply;
26

- ↗ design of the wholesale contract;
- ↗ development of retail rates for recovery of ComEd's POLR costs;
- ↗ safeguards for the retail market; and
- ↗ customers POLR eligibility, notice requirements and switching rules.

Q. GIVEN THE COMPLEXITY OF DEVELOPING SUCH A PROGRAM, WHAT DO YOU RECOMMEND?

A. I recommend that the Commission find that Rate HEP is not by itself a fully adequate POLR service and that a fixed or stable price option is essential. With Rate 6L unavailable after June 2003 (except for grandfathered customers), the Commission should direct that ComEd provide a market-based POLR based on the competitive acquisition of wholesale power. The Commission should direct ComEd and interested parties to convene a settlement process to develop a POLR process that could be implemented by year-end 2003.

Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY?

A. Yes, it does.

ATTACHMENT A

QUALIFICATIONS OF MATTHEW I. KAHAL

MATTHEW I. KAHAL

Mr. Kahal is currently an independent consulting economist, specializing in energy economics, public utility regulation and financial analysis. Over the past two decades, his work has encompassed electric utility integrated resource planning (IRP), power plant licensing and a wide range of utility financial issues. In the financial area he has conducted numerous cost of capital studies and addressed other financial issues for electric, gas, telephone and water utilities. Mr. Kahal's work in recent years has shifted to electric utility restructuring, mergers and competition.

Mr. Kahal has provided expert testimony on more than 200 occasions before state and federal regulatory commissions and the U.S. Congress. His testimony has covered need for power, integrated resource planning, cost of capital, purchased power practices and contracts, merger economics, industry restructuring and various other regulatory policy issues.

Education:

B.A. (Economics) - University of Maryland, 1971.

M.A. (Economics) - University of Maryland, 1974.

Ph.D. candidate - University of Maryland, completed all course work
and qualifying examinations.

Previous Employment:

1981-2001 - Exeter Associates, Inc. (founding Principal).

1980-1981 - Member of the Economic Evaluation Directorate, The Aerospace Corporation, Washington, D.C. office.

1977-1980 - Economist, Washington, D.C. consulting firm.

1972-1977 - Research/Teaching Assistant and Instructor, Department of Economics, University of Maryland (College Park).

1975-1977 - Lecturer in Business/Economics, Montgomery College.

Professional Work Experience:

Mr. Kahal has more than twenty years experience managing and conducting consulting assignments relating to public utility economics and regulation. In 1981, he and five colleagues founded the firm of Exeter Associates, Inc. and for the next 20 years he served as a Principal and corporate officer in the firm. During that time, he supervised multi-million dollar support contracts with the State of Maryland and directed the technical work conducted both by Exeter

professional staff and numerous subcontractors. Additionally, Mr. Kahal took the lead role at Exeter in consulting to the firm's other governmental and private clients in the areas of financial analysis, utility mergers, electric restructuring and utility purchase power contracts.

At the Aerospace Corporation, Mr. Kahal served as an economic consultant to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve (SPR). In that capacity he participated in a detailed financial assessment of the SPR, and developed an econometric forecasting model of U.S. petroleum industry inventories. That study has been used to determine the extent to which private sector petroleum stocks can be expected to protect the U.S. from the impacts of oil import interruptions.

Before entering consulting, Mr. Kahal held faculty positions with the Department of Economics at the University of Maryland and with Montgomery College teaching courses on economic principles, business and economic development.

Publications and Consulting Reports:

Projected Electric Power Demands of the Baltimore Gas and Electric Company, Maryland Power Plant Siting Program, 1979.

Projected Electric Power Demands of the Allegheny Power System, Maryland Power Plant Siting Program, January 1980.

An Econometric Forecast of Electric Energy and Peak Demand on the Delmarva Peninsula, Maryland Power Plant Siting Program, March 1980 (with Ralph E. Miller).

A Benefit/Cost Methodology of the Marginal Cost Pricing of Tennessee Valley Authority Electricity, prepared for the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, April 1980.

An Evaluation of the Delmarva Power and Light Company Generating Capacity Profile and Expansion Plan, (Interim Report), prepared for the Delaware Office of the Public Advocate, July 1980, (with Sharon L. Mason).

Rhode Island-DOE Electric Utilities Demonstration Project, Third Interim Report on Preliminary Analysis of the Experimental Results, prepared for the Economic Regulatory Administration, U.S. Department of Energy, July 1980.

Petroleum Inventories and the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, The Aerospace Corporation, prepared for the Strategic Petroleum Reserve Office, U.S. Department of Energy, December 1980.

Alternatives to Central Station Coal and Nuclear Power Generation, prepared for Argonne National Laboratory and the Office of Utility Systems, U.S. Department of Energy, August 1981.

"An Econometric Methodology for Forecasting Power Demands," Conducting Need-for-Power Review for Nuclear Power Plants (D.A. Nash, ed.), U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, NUREG-0942, December 1982.

State Regulatory Attitudes Toward Fuel Expense Issues, prepared for the Electric Power Research Institute, July 1983, (with Dale E. Swan).

"Problems in the Use of Econometric Methods in Load Forecasting," Adjusting to Regulatory, Pricing and Marketing Realities (Harry Trebing, ed.), Institute of Public Utilities, Michigan State University, 1983.

Proceedings of the Maryland Conference on Electric Load Forecasting, (editor and contributing author), Maryland Power Plant Siting Program, PPES-83-4, October 1983.

"The Impacts of Utility-Sponsored Weatherization Programs: The Case of Maryland Utilities," (with others), in Government and Energy Policy (Richard L. Itteilag, ed.), 1983.

Power Plant Cumulative Environmental Impact Report, contributing author, (Paul E. Miller, ed.) Maryland Department of Natural Resources, January 1984.

Projected Electric Power Demands for the Potomac Electric Power Company, three volumes with Steven L. Estomin), prepared for the Maryland Power Plant Siting Program, March 1984.

"An Assessment of the State-of-the-Art of Gas Utility Load Forecasting," (with Thomas Bacon, Jr. and Steven L. Estomin), published in the Proceedings of the Fourth NARUC Biennial Regulatory Information Conference, 1984.

"Nuclear Power and Investor Perceptions of Risk," (with Ralph E. Miller), published in The Energy Industries in Transition: 1985-2000 (John P. Weyant and Dorothy Sheffield, eds.), 1984.

The Financial Impact of Potential Department of Energy Rate Recommendations on the Commonwealth Edison Company, prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy, October 1984.

"Discussion Comments," published in Impact of Deregulation and Market Forces on Public Utilities: The Future of Regulation (Harry Trebing, ed.), Institute of Public Utilities, Michigan State University, 1985.

An Econometric Forecast of the Electric Power Loads of Baltimore Gas and Electric Company, two volumes (with others), prepared for the Maryland Power Plant Siting Program, 1985.

A Survey and Evaluation of Demand Forecast Methods in the Gas Utility Industry, prepared for the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, Forecasting Division, November 1985, (with Terence Manuel).

A Review and Evaluation of the Load Forecasts of Houston Lighting & Power Company and Central Power & Light Company -- Past and Present, prepared for the Texas Public Utility Commission, December 1985, (with Marvin H. Kahn).

Power Plant Cumulative Environmental Impact Report for Maryland, principal author of three of the eight chapters in the report (Paul E. Miller, ed.), PPSP-CEIR-5, March 1986.

"Potential Emissions Reduction from Conservation, Load Management, and Alternative Power," published in Acid Deposition in Maryland: A Report to the Governor and General Assembly, Maryland Power Plant Research Program, AD-87-1, January 1987.

Determination of Retrofit Costs at the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station, March 1988, prepared for Versar, Inc., New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection.

Excess Deferred Taxes and the Telephone Utility Industry, April 1988, prepared on behalf of the National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates.

Toward a Proposed Federal Policy for Independent Power Producers, comments prepared on behalf of the Indiana Consumer Counselor, FERC Docket EL87-67-000, November 1987.

Review and Discussion of Regulations Governing Bidding Programs, prepared for the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate, June 1988.

A Review of the Proposed Revisions to the FERC Administrative Rules on Avoided Costs and Related Issues, prepared for the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate, April 1988.

Review and Comments on the FERC NOPR Concerning Independent Power Producers, prepared for the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate, June 1988.

The Costs to Maryland Utilities and Ratepayers of an Acid Rain Control Strategy -- An Updated Analysis, prepared for the Maryland Power Plant Research Program, October 1987, AD-88-4.

"Comments," in New Regulatory and Management Strategies in a Changing Market Environment (Harry M. Trebing and Patrick C. Mann, editors), Proceedings of the Institute of Public Utilities Eighteenth Annual Conference, 1987.

Electric Power Resource Planning for the Potomac Electric Power Company, prepared for the Maryland Power Plant Research Program, July 1988.

Power Plant Cumulative Environmental Impact Report for Maryland (Thomas E. Magette, ed.)
authored two chapters, November 1988, PPRP-CEIR-6.

Resource Planning and Competitive Bidding for Delmarva Power & Light Company, October
1990, prepared for the Maryland Department of Natural Resources (with M.
Fullenbaum).

Electric Power Rate Increases and the Cleveland Area Economy, prepared for the Northeast Ohio
Areawide Coordinating Agency, October 1988.

An Economic and Need for Power Evaluation of Baltimore Gas & Electric Company's Perryman
Plant, May 1991, prepared for the Maryland Department of Natural Resources (with M.
Fullenbaum).

The Cost of Equity Capital for the Bell Local Exchange Companies in a New Era of Regulation,
October 1991, presented at the Atlantic Economic Society 32nd Conference, Washington,
D.C.

A Need for Power Review of Delmarva Power & Light Company's Dorchester Unit 1 Power
Plant, March 1993, prepared for the Maryland Department of National Resources (with
M. Fullenbaum)

The AES Warrior Run Project: Impact on Western Maryland Economic Activity and Electric
Rates, February 1993, prepared for the Maryland Power Plant Research Program (with
Peter Hall).

An Economic Perspective on Competition and the Electric Utility Industry, November 1994.
Prepared for the Electric Consumers' Alliance.

PEPCO's Clean Air Act Compliance Plan: Status Report, prepared for the Maryland Power Plant
Research Plan, January 1995 (w/Diane Mountain, Environmental Resources
Management, Inc.).

The FERC Open Access Rulemaking: A Review of the Issues, prepared for the Indiana Office
of Utility Consumer Counselor and the Pennsylvania Office of Consumer Advocate, June
1995.

A Status Report on Electric Utility Restructuring: Issues for Maryland, prepared for the
Maryland Power Plant Research Program, November 1995 (with Daphne
Psacharopoulos).

Modeling the Financial Impacts on the Bell Regional Holding Companies from Changes in
Access Rates, prepared for MCI Corporation, May 1996.

The CSEF Electric Deregulation Study: Economic Miracle or the Economists' Cold Fusion?, prepared for the Electric Consumers' Alliance, Indianapolis, Indiana, October 1996.

Reducing Rates for Interstate Access Service: Financial Impacts on the Bell Regional Holding Companies, prepared for MCI Corporation, May 1997.

The New Hampshire Retail Competition Pilot Program: A Preliminary Evaluation, July 1997, prepared for the Electric Consumers' Alliance (with Jerome D. Mierzwa).

Electric Restructuring and the Environment: Issue Identification for Maryland, March 1997, prepared for the Maryland Power Plant Research Program (with Environmental Resource Management, Inc.)

An Analysis of Electric Utility Embedded Power Supply Costs, prepared for Power-Gen International Conference, Dallas, Texas, December 1997.

Market Power Outlook for Generation Supply in Louisiana, December 2000, prepared for the Louisiana Public Service Commission (with others).

A Review of Issues Concerning Electric Power Capacity Markets, prepared for the Maryland Power Plant Research Program, December 2001 (with B. Hobbs and J. Inon).

Conference and Workshop Presentations:

Workshop on State Load Forecasting Programs, sponsored by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and Oak Ridge National Laboratory, February 1982 (presentation on forecasting methodology).

Fourteenth Annual Conference of the Michigan State University Institute for Public Utilities, December 1982 (presentation on problems in forecasting).

Conference on Conservation and Load Management, sponsored by the Massachusetts Energy Facilities Siting Council, May 1983 (presentation on cost-benefit criteria).

Maryland Conference on Load Forecasting, sponsored by the Maryland Power Plant Siting Program and the Maryland Public Service Commission, June 1983 (presentation on overforecasting power demands).

The 5th Annual Meetings of the International Association of Energy Economists, June 1983 (presentation on evaluating weatherization programs).

The NARUC Advanced Regulatory Studies Program (presented lectures on capacity planning for electric utilities), February 1984.

The 16th Annual Conference of the Institute of Public Utilities, Michigan State University (discussant on phase-in and excess capacity), December 1984.

U.S. Department of Energy Utilities Conference, Las Vegas, Nevada (presentation of current and future regulatory issues), May 1985.

The 18th Annual Conference of the Institute of Public Utilities, Michigan State University, Williamsburg, Virginia, December 1986 (discussant on cogeneration).

The NRECA Conference on Load Forecasting, sponsored by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, December 1987 (presentation on load forecast accuracy).

The Second Rutgers/New Jersey Department of Commerce Annual Conference on Energy Policy in the Middle Atlantic States, Rutgers University, April 1988 (presentation on spot pricing of electricity).

The NASUCA 1988 Mid-Year Meeting, Annapolis, Maryland, June 1988, sponsored by the National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates (presentation on the FERC electricity avoided cost NOPRs).

The Thirty Second Atlantic Economic Society Conference, Washington, D.C., October 1991 (presentation of a paper on cost of capital issues for the Bell Operating Companies).

The NASUCA 1993 Mid-Year Meeting, St. Louis, Missouri, sponsored by the National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates, June 1993 (presentation on regulatory issues concerning electric utility mergers).

The NASUCA and NARUC annual meetings in New York City, November 1993 (presentations and panel discussions on the emerging FERC policies on transmission pricing).

The NASUCA annual meetings in Reno, Nevada, November 1994 (presentation concerning the FERC NOPR on stranded cost recovery).

U.S. Department of Energy Utilities/Energy Management Workshop, March 1995 (presentation concerning electric utility competition).

The 1995 NASUCA Mid-Year Meeting, Breckenridge, Colorado, June 1995, (presentation concerning the FERC rulemaking on electric transmission open access).

The 1996 NASUCA Mid-Year Meeting, Chicago, Illinois, June 1996 (presentation concerning electric utility merger issues).

Conference on “Restructuring the Electric Industry,” sponsored by the National Consumers League and Electric Consumers Alliance, Washington, D.C., May 1997 (presentation on retail access pilot programs).

The 1997 Mid-Atlantic Conference of Regulatory Utilities Commissioners (MARUC), Hot Springs, Virginia, July 1997 (presentation concerning electric deregulation issues).

Power-Gen ‘97 International Conference, Dallas, Texas, December 1997 (presentation concerning utility embedded costs of generation supply).

Consumer Summit on Electric Competition, sponsored by the National Consumers League and Electric Consumers’ Alliance, Washington, D.C., March 2001 (presentation concerning generation supply and reliability).

National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates, Mid-Year Meetings, Austin, Texas, June 16-17, 2002 (presenter and panelist on RTO/Standard Market Design issues).

Louisiana State Bar Association, Public Utility Section, October 2, 2002. (Presentation on Performance-Based Ratemaking and panelist on RTO issues). Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Expert Testimony
of Matthew I. Kahal

	<u>Docket Number</u>	<u>Utility</u>	<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Client</u>	<u>Subject</u>
1.	27374 & 27375 October 1978	Long Island Lighting Company	New York Counties	Nassau & Suffolk	Economic impacts of proposed rate increase
2.	6807 January 1978	Generic	Maryland	MD Power Plant Siting Program	Load forecasting
3.	78-676-EL-AIR February 1978	Ohio Power Company	Ohio	Ohio Consumers' Counsel	Test year sales and revenues
4.	17667 May 1979	Alabama Power Company	Alabama	Attorney General	Test year sales, revenues, costs and load forecasts
5.	None April 1980	Tennessee Valley Authority	TVA Board	League of Women Voters	Time-of-use pricing
6.	R-80021082	West Penn Power Company	Pennsylvania	Office of Consumer Advocate	Load forecasting, marginal cost pricing
7.	7259 (Phase I) October 1980	Potomac Edison Company	Maryland	MD Power Plant Siting Program	Load forecasting
8.	7222 December 1980	Delmarva Power & Light Company	Maryland	MD Power Plant Siting Program	Need for plant, load forecasting
9.	7441 June 1981	Potomac Electric Power Company	Maryland	Commission Staff	PURPA standards
10.	7159 May 1980	Baltimore Gas & Electric	Maryland	Commission Staff	Time-of-use pricing
11.	81-044-E-42T	Monongahela Power	West Virginia	Commission Staff	Time-of-use rates
12.	7259 (Phase II) November 1981	Potomac Edison Company	Maryland	MD Power Plant Siting Program	Load forecasting, load management
13.	1606 September 1981	Blackstone Valley Electric and Narragansett	Rhode Island	Division of Public Utilities	PURPA standards
14.	RID 1819 April 1982	Pennsylvania Bell	Pennsylvania	Office of Consumer Advocate	Rate of return
15.	82-0152 July 1982	Illinois Power Company	Illinois	U.S. Department of Defense	Rate of return, CWIP

Expert Testimony
of Matthew I. Kahal

	<u>Docket Number</u>	<u>Utility</u>	<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Client</u>	<u>Subject</u>
16.	7559 September 1982	Potomac Edison Company	Maryland	Commission Staff	Cogeneration
17.	820150-EU September 1982	Gulf Power Company	Florida	Federal Executive Agencies	Rate of return, CWIP
18.	82-057-15 January 1983	Mountain Fuel Supply Company	Utah	Federal Executive Agencies	Rate of return, capital structure
19.	5200 August 1983	Texas Electric Service Company	Texas	Federal Executive Agencies	Cost of equity
20.	28069 August 1983	Oklahoma Natural Gas	Oklahoma	Federal Executive Agencies	Rate of return, deferred taxes, capital structure, attrition
21.	83-0537 February 1984	Commonwealth Edison Company	Illinois	U.S. Department of Energy	Rate of return, capital structure, financial capability
22.	84-035-01 June 1984	Utah Power & Light Company	Utah	Federal Executive Agencies	Rate of return
23.	U-1009-137 July 1984	Utah Power & Light Company	Idaho	U.S. Department of Energy	Rate of return, financial condition
24.	R-842590 August 1984	Philadelphia Electric Company	Pennsylvania	Office of Consumer Advocate	Rate of return
25.	840086-EI August 1984	Gulf Power Company	Florida	Federal Executive Agencies	Rate of return, CWIP
26.	84-122-E August 1984	Carolina Power & Light Company	South Carolina	South Carolina Consumer Advocate	Rate of return, CWIP, load forecasting
27.	CGC-83-G & CGC-84-G October 1984	Columbia Gas of Ohio	Ohio	Ohio Division of Energy	Load forecasting
28.	R-842621 October 1984	Western Pennsylvania Water Company	Pennsylvania	Office of Consumer Advocate	Test year sales
29.	R-842710 January 1985	ALLTEL Pennsylvania Inc.	Pennsylvania	Office of Consumer Advocate	Rate of return

Expert Testimony
of Matthew I. Kahal

	<u>Docket Number</u>	<u>Utility</u>	<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Client</u>	<u>Subject</u>
30.	ER-504 February 1985	Allegheny Generating Company	FERC	Office of Consumer Advocate	Rate of return
31.	R-842632 March 1985	West Penn Power Company	Pennsylvania	Office of Consumer Advocate	Rate of return, conservation, time-of-use rates
32.	83-0537 & 84-0555 April 1985	Commonwealth Edison Company	Illinois	U.S. Department of Energy	Rate of return, incentive rates, rate base
33.	Rulemaking Docket No. 11, May 1985	Generic	Delaware	Delaware Commission Staff	Interest rates on refunds
34.	29450 July 1985	Oklahoma Gas & Electric Company	Oklahoma	Oklahoma Attorney General	Rate of return, CWIP in rate base
35.	1811 August 1985	Bristol County Water Company	Rhode Island	Division of Public Utilities	Rate of return, capital structure
36.	R-850044 & R-850045 August 1985	Quaker State & Continental Telephone Companies	Pennsylvania	Office of Consumer Advocate	Rate of return
37.	R-850174 November 1985	Philadelphia Suburban Water Company	Pennsylvania	Office of Consumer Advocate	Rate of return, financial conditions
38.	U-1006-265 March 1986	Idaho Power Company	Idaho	U.S. Department of Energy	Power supply costs and models
39.	EL-86-37 & EL-86-38 September 1986	Allegheny Generating Company	FERC	PA Office of Consumer Advocate	Rate of return
40.	R-850287 June 1986	National Fuel Gas Distribution Corp.	Pennsylvania	Office of Consumer Advocate	Rate of return
41.	1849 August 1986	Blackstone Valley Electric	Rhode Island	Division of Public Utilities	Rate of return, financial condition
42.	86-297-GA-AIR November 1986	East Ohio Gas Company	Ohio	Ohio Consumers' Counsel	Rate of return
43.	U-16945 December 1986	Louisiana Power & Light Company	Louisiana	Public Service Commission	Rate of return, rate phase-in plan

Expert Testimony
of Matthew I. Kahal

	<u>Docket Number</u>	<u>Utility</u>	<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Client</u>	<u>Subject</u>
44.	Case No. 7972 February 1987	Potomac Electric Power Company	Maryland	Commission Staff	Generation capacity planning, purchased power contract
45.	EL-86-58 & EL-86-59 March 1987	System Energy Resources and Middle South Services	FERC	Louisiana PSC	Rate of return
46.	ER-87-72-001 April 1987	Orange & Rockland	FERC	PA Office of Consumer Advocate	Rate of return
47.	U-16945 April 1987	Louisiana Power & Light Company	Louisiana	Commission Staff	Revenue requirement update phase-in plan
48.	P-870196 May 1987	Pennsylvania Electric Company	Pennsylvania	Office of Consumer Advocate	Cogeneration contract
49.	86-2025-EL-AIR June 1987	Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company	Ohio	Ohio Consumers' Counsel	Rate of return
50.	86-2026-EL-AIR June 1987	Toledo Edison Company	Ohio	Ohio Consumers' Counsel	Rate of return
51.	87-4 June 1987	Delmarva Power & Light Company	Delaware	Commission Staff	Cogeneration/small power
52.	1872 July 1987	Newport Electric Company	Rhode Island	Commission Staff	Rate of return
53.	WO 8606654 July 1987	Atlantic City Sewerage Company	New Jersey	Resorts International	Financial condition
54.	7510 August 1987	West Texas Utilities Company	Texas	Federal Executive Agencies	Rate of return, phase-in
55.	8063 Phase I October 1987	Potomac Electric Power Company	Maryland	Power Plant Research Program	Economics of power plant site selection
56.	00439 November 1987	Oklahoma Gas & Electric Company	Oklahoma	Smith Cogeneration	Cogeneration economics
57.	RP-87-103 February 1988	Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Company	FERC	Indiana Utility Consumer Counselor	Rate of return

Expert Testimony
of Matthew I. Kahal

	<u>Docket Number</u>	<u>Utility</u>	<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Client</u>	<u>Subject</u>
58.	EC-88-2-000 February 1988	Utah Power & Light Co. PacifiCorp	FERC	Nucor Steel	Merger economics
59.	87-0427 February 1988	Commonwealth Edison Company	Illinois	Federal Executive Agencies	Financial projections
60.	870840 February 1988	Philadelphia Suburban Water Company	Pennsylvania	Office of Consumer Advocate	Rate of return
61.	870832 March 1988	Columbia Gas of Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	Office of Consumer Advocate	Rate of return
62.	8063 Phase II July 1988	Potomac Electric Power Company	Maryland	Power Plant Research Program	Power supply study
63.	8102 July 1988	Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	Maryland	Power Plant Research Program	Power supply study
64.	10105 August 1988	South Central Bell Telephone Co.	Kentucky	Attorney General	Rate of return, incentive regulation
65.	00345 August 1988	Oklahoma Gas & Electric Company	Oklahoma	Smith Cogeneration	Need for power
66.	U-17906 September 1988	Louisiana Power & Light Company	Louisiana	Commission Staff	Rate of return, nuclear power costs Industrial contracts
67.	88-170-EL-AIR October 1988	Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co.	Ohio	Northeast-Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency	Economic impact study
68.	1914 December 1988	Providence Gas Company	Rhode Island	Commission Staff	Rate of return
69.	U-12636 & U-17649 February 1989	Louisiana Power & Light Company	Louisiana	Commission Staff	Disposition of litigation proceeds
70.	00345 February 1989	Oklahoma Gas & Electric Company	Oklahoma	Smith Cogeneration	Load forecasting
71.	RP88-209 March 1989	Natural Gas Pipeline of America	FERC	Indiana Utility Consumer Counselor	Rate of return

Expert Testimony
of Matthew I. Kahal

<u>Docket Number</u>	<u>Utility</u>	<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Client</u>	<u>Subject</u>
<u>Expert Testimony of Matthew I. Kahal</u>				
<u>Docket Number</u>	<u>Utility</u>	<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Client</u>	<u>Subject</u>
72. 8425 March 1989	Houston Lighting & Power Company	Texas	U.S. Department of Energy	Rate of return
73. EL89-30-000 April 1989	Central Illinois Public Service Company	FERC	Soyland Power Coop, Inc.	Rate of return
74. R-891208 May 1989	Pennsylvania American Water Company	Pennsylvania	Office of Consumer Advocate	Rate of return
75. 89-0033 May 1989	Illinois Bell Telephone Company	Illinois	Citizens Utility Board	Rate of return
76. 881167-EI May 1989	Gulf Power Company	Florida	Federal Executive Agencies	Rate of return
77. R-891218 July 1989	National Fuel Gas Distribution Company	Pennsylvania	Office of Consumer Advocate	Sales forecasting
78. 8063, Phase III Sept. 1989	Potomac Electric Power Company	Maryland	Depart. Natural Resources	Emissions Controls
79. 37414-S2 October 1989	Public Service Company of Indiana	Indiana	Utility Consumer Counselor	Rate of return, DSM, off- system sales, incentive regulation
80. October 1989	Generic	U.S. House of Reps. Comm. on Ways & Means	NA	Excess deferred income tax
81. 38728 November 1989	Indiana Michigan Power Company	Indiana	Utility Consumer Counselor	Rate of return
82. RP89-49-000 December 1989	National Fuel Gas Supply Corporation	FERC	PA Office of Consumer Advocate	Rate of return
83. R-891364 December 1989	Philadelphia Electric Company	Pennsylvania	PA Office of Consumer Advocate	Financial impacts (surrebuttal only)

Expert Testimony
of Matthew I. Kahal

	<u>Docket Number</u>	<u>Utility</u>	<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Client</u>	<u>Subject</u>
84.	RP89-160-000 January 1990	Trunkline Gas Company	FERC	Indiana Utility Consumer Counselor	Rate of return
85.	EL90-16-000 November 1990	System Energy Resources, Inc.	FERC	Louisiana Public Service Commission	Rate of return
86.	89-624 March 1990	Bell Atlantic	FCC	PA Office of Consumer Advocate	Rate of return
87.	8245 March 1990	Potomac Edison Company	Maryland	Depart. Natural Resources	Avoided Cost
88.	000586 March 1990	Public Service Company of Oklahoma	Oklahoma	Smith Cogeneration Mgmt.	Need for Power
89.	38868 March 1990	Indianapolis Water Company	Indiana	Utility Consumer Counselor	Rate of return
90.	1946 March 1990	Blackstone Valley Electric Company	Rhode Island	Division of Public Utilities	Rate of return
91.	000776 April 1990	Oklahoma Gas & Electric Company	Oklahoma	Smith Cogeneration Mgmt.	Need for Power
92.	890366 May 1990, December 1990	Metropolitan Edison Company	Pennsylvania	Office of Consumer Advocate	Competitive Bidding Program Avoided Costs
93.	EC-90-10-000 May 1990	Northeast Utilities	FERC	Maine PUC, <u>et. al.</u>	Merger, Market Power, Transmission Access
94.	ER-891109125 July 1990	Jersey Central Power & Light	New Jersey	Rate Counsel	Rate of return
95.	R-901670 July 1990	National Fuel Gas Distribution Corp.	Pennsylvania	Office of Consumer Advocate	Rate of return Test year sales
96.	8201 October 1990	Delmarva Power & Light Company	Maryland	Depart. Natural Resources	Competitive Bidding, Resource Planning
97.	EL90-45-000 April 1991	Entergy Services, Inc.	FERC	Louisiana PSC	Rate of return

Expert Testimony
of Matthew I. Kahal

	<u>Docket Number</u>	<u>Utility</u>	<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Client</u>	<u>Subject</u>
98.	GR90080786J January 1991	New Jersey Natural Gas	New Jersey	Rate Counsel	Rate of return
99.	90-256 January 1991	South Central Bell Telephone Co.	Kentucky	Attorney General	Rate of return
100.	U-17949A February 1991	South Central Bell Telephone Co.	Louisiana	Louisiana PSC	Rate of return
101.	ER90091090J April 1991	Atlantic City Electric Company	New Jersey	Rate Counsel	Rate of return
102.	8241, Phase I April 1991	Baltimore Gas & Electric Co.	Maryland	Dept. of Natural Resources	Environmental controls
103.	8241, Phase II May 1991	Baltimore Gas & Electric Company	Maryland	Dept. of Natural Resources	Need for Power, Resource Planning
104.	39128 May 1991	Indianapolis Water Company	Indiana	Utility Consumer Counselor	Rate of return, rate base, financial planning
105.	P-900485 May 1991	Duquesne Light Company	Pennsylvania	Office of Consumer Advocate	Purchased power contract and related ratemaking
106.	G900240 P910502 May 1991	Metropolitan Edison Co. Pennsylvania Electric Co.	Pennsylvania	Office of Consumer Advocate	Purchased power contract and related ratemaking
107.	GR901213915 May 1991	Elizabethtown Gas Co.	New Jersey	Rate Counsel	Rate of return
108.	91-5032 August 1991	Nevada Power Co.	Nevada	U.S. Dept. of Energy	Rate of return
109.	EL90-48-000 November 1991	Entergy Services	FERC	Louisiana PSC	Capacity transfer
110.	000662 September 1991	Southwestern Bell Telephone	Oklahoma	Attorney General	Rate of return
111.	U-19236 October 1991	Arkansas Louisiana Gas Company	Louisiana	Louisiana PSC Staff	Rate of return

Expert Testimony
of Matthew I. Kahal

	<u>Docket Number</u>	<u>Utility</u>	<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Client</u>	<u>Subject</u>
112.	U-19237 December 1991	Louisiana Gas Service Company	Louisiana	Louisiana PSC Staff	Rate of return
113.	ER91030356J October 1991	Rockland Electric Company	New Jersey	Rate Counsel	Rate of return
114.	GR91071243J February 1992	South Jersey Gas Company	New Jersey	Rate Counsel	Rate of return
115.	GR91081393J March 1992	New Jersey Natural Gas Company	New Jersey	Rate Counsel	Rate of return
116.	P-870235 <u>et al.</u> March 1992	Pennsylvania Electric Company	Pennsylvania	Office of Consumer Advocate	Cogeneration contracts
117.	8413 March 1992	Potomac Electric Power Company	Maryland	Dept. of Natural Resources	IPP purchased power contracts
118.	39236 March 1992	Indianapolis Power & Light Company	Indiana	Utility Consumer Counselor	Least-cost planning Need for power
119.	R-912164 April 1992	Equitable Gas Company	Pennsylvania	Office of Consumer Advocate	Rate of return
120.	ER-91111698J May 1992	Public Service Electric & Gas Company	New Jersey	Rate Counsel	Rate of return
121.	U-19631 June 1992	Trans Louisiana Gas Company	Louisiana	PSC Staff	Rate of return
122.	ER-91121820J July 1992	Jersey Central Power & Light Company	New Jersey	Rate Counsel	Rate of return
123.	R-00922314 August 1992	Metropolitan Edison Company	Pennsylvania	Office of Consumer Advocate	Rate of return
124.	92-049-05 September 1992	US West Communications	Utah	Committee of Consumer Services	Rate of return
125.	92PUE0037 September 1992	Commonwealth Gas Company	Virginia	Attorney General	Rate of return

Expert Testimony
of Matthew I. Kahal

	<u>Docket Number</u>	<u>Utility</u>	<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Client</u>	<u>Subject</u>
126.	EC92-21-000 September 1992	Entergy Services, Inc.	FERC	Louisiana PSC	Merger Impacts (Affidavit)
127.	ER92-341-000 December 1992	System Energy Resources	FERC	Louisiana PSC	Rate of return
128.	U-19904 November 1992	Louisiana Power & Light Company	Louisiana	Staff	Merger analysis, competition competition issues
129.	8473 November 1992	Baltimore Gas & Electric Company	Maryland	Dept. of Natural Resources	QF contract evaluation
130.	IPC-E-92-25 January 1993	Idaho Power Company	Idaho	Federal Executive Agencies	Power supply clause
131.	E002/GR-92-1185 February 1993	Northern States Power Company	Minnesota	Attorney General	Rate of return
132.	92-102, Phase II March 1992	Central Maine Power Company	Maine	Staff	QF contracts prudence and procurements practices
133.	EC92-21-000 March 1993	Entergy Corporation	FERC	Louisiana PSC	Merger issues
134.	8489 March 1993	Delmarva Power & Light Company	Maryland	Dept. of Natural Resources	Power plant certification
135.	11735 April 1993	Texas Electric Utilities Company	Texas	Federal Executives Agencies	Rate of return
136.	2082 May 1993	Providence Gas Company	Rhode Island	Division of Public Utilities	Rate of return
137.	P-00930715 December 1993	Bell Telephone Co. of Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	Office of Consumer Advocate	Rate of return, financial projections, Bell/TCI merger
138.	R-00932670 February 1994	Pennsylvania-American Water Company	Pennsylvania	Office of Consumer Advocate	Rate of return
139.	8583 February 1994	Conowingo Power Co.	Maryland	Dept. of Natural Resources	Competitive bidding for power supplies

Expert Testimony
of Matthew I. Kahal

	<u>Docket Number</u>	<u>Utility</u>	<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Client</u>	<u>Subject</u>
140.	E-015/GR-94-001 April 1994	Minnesota Power & Light Co.	Minnesota	Attorney General	Rate of return
141.	CC Docket No. 94-1 May 1994	Generic Telephone	FCC	MCI Comm. Corp.	Rate of return
142.	92-345, Phase II June 1994	Central Maine Power Co.	Maine	Advocacy Staff	Price Cap Regulation Fuel Costs
143.	93-11065 April 1994	Nevada Power Co.	Nevada	Federal Executive Agencies	Rate of return
144.	94-0065 May 1994	Commonwealth Edison Co.	Illinois	Federal Executive Agencies	Rate of return
145.	GR94010002J June 1994	South Jersey Gas Co.	New Jersey	Rate Counsel	Rate of return
146.	WR94030059 July 1994	New Jersey-American Water Co.	New Jersey	Rate Counsel	Rate of return
147.	RP91-203-000 June 1994	Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company	FERC	Customer Group	Environmental Externalities (oral testimony only)
148.	ER94-998-000 July 1994	Ocean State Power	FERC	Boston Edison Co.	Rate of return
149.	R-00942986 July 1994	West Penn Power Co.	Pennsylvania	Office of Consumer Advocate	Rate of return, emission allowances
150.	94-121 August 1994	South Central Bell Telephone Co.	Kentucky	Attorney General	Rate of return
151.	35854-S2 November 1994	PSI Energy, Inc.	Indiana	Utility Consumer Counsel	Merger savings and allocations
152.	IPC-E-94-5 November 1994	Idaho Power Co.	Idaho	Federal Executive Agencies	Rate of return
153.	November 1994	Edmonton Water	Alberta, Canada	Regional Customer Group	Rate of return (rebuttal only)

Expert Testimony
of Matthew I. Kahal

	<u>Docket Number</u>	<u>Utility</u>	<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Client</u>	<u>Subject</u>
154.	90-256 December 1994	South Central Bell Telephone Co.	Kentucky	Attorney General	Incentive Plan True-Ups
155.	U-20925 February 1995	Louisiana Power & Light Company	Louisiana	PSC Staff	Rate of return Industrial contracts Trust fund earnings
156.	R-00943231 February 1995	Pennsylvania-American Water Company	Pennsylvania	Consumer Advocate	Rate of return
157.	8678 March 1995	Generic	Maryland	Dept. Natural Resources	Electric Competition Incentive Regulation (oral only)
158.	R-000943271 April 1995	Pennsylvania Power & Light Company	Pennsylvania	Consumer Advocate	Rate of return Nuclear decommissioning Capacity Issues
159.	U-20925 May 1995	Louisiana Power & Light Company	Louisiana	Commission Staff	Class cost of service issues
160.	2290 June 1995	Narragansett Electric Company	Rhode Island	Division Staff	Rate of return
161.	U-17949E June 1995	South Central Bell Telephone Company	Louisiana	Commission Staff	Rate of return
162.	2304 July 1995	Providence Water Supply Board	Rhode Island	Division Staff	Cost recovery of capital spending program
163.	ER95-625-000 <u>et al.</u> August 1995	PSI Energy, Inc.	FERC	Office of Utility Consumer Counselor	Rate of return
164.	P-00950915 <u>et al.</u> September 1995	Paxton Creek Cogeneration Assoc.	Pennsylvania	Office of Consumer Advocate	Cogeneration contract amendment
165.	8702 September 1995	Potomac Edison Company	Maryland	Dept. of Natural Resources	Allocation of DSM Costs (oral only)
166.	ER95-533-001 September 1995	Ocean State Power	FERC	Boston Edison Co.	Cost of equity

Expert Testimony
of Matthew I. Kahal

	<u>Docket Number</u>	<u>Utility</u>	<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Client</u>	<u>Subject</u>
167.	40003 November 1995	PSI Energy, Inc.	Indiana	Utility Consumer Counselor	Rate of return Retail wheeling
168.	P-55, SUB 1013 January 1996	BellSouth	North Carolina	AT&T	Rate of return
169.	P-7, SUB 825 January 1996	Carolina Tel.	North Carolina	AT&T	Rate of return
170.	February 1996	Generic Telephone	FCC	MCI	Cost of capital
171.	95A-531EG April 1996	Public Service Company of Colorado	Colorado	Federal Executive Agencies	Merger issues
172.	ER96-399-000 May 1996	Northern Indiana Public Service Company	FERC	Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor	Cost of capital
173.	8716 June 1996	Delmarva Power & Light Company	Maryland	Dept. of Natural Resources	DSM programs
174.	8725 July 1996	BGE/PEPCO	Maryland	Md. Energy Admin.	Merger Issues
175.	U-20925 August 1996	Entergy Louisiana, Inc.	Louisiana	PSC Staff	Rate of return Allocations Fuel Clause
176.	EC96-10-000 September 1996	BGE/PEPCO	FERC	Md. Energy Admin.	Merger issues competition
177.	EL95-53-000 November 1996	Entergy Services, Inc.	FERC	Louisiana PSC	Nuclear Decommissioning
178.	WR96100768 March 1997	Consumers NJ Water Company	New Jersey	Ratepayer Advocate	Cost of Capital
179.	WR96110818 April 1997	Middlesex Water Co.	New Jersey	Ratepayer Advocate	Cost of Capital
180.	U-11366 April 1997	Ameritech Michigan	Michigan	MCI	Access charge reform/financial condition

Expert Testimony
of Matthew I. Kahal

	<u>Docket Number</u>	<u>Utility</u>	<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Client</u>	<u>Subject</u>
181.	97-074 May 1997	BellSouth	Kentucky	MCI	Rate Rebalancing financial condition
182.	2540 June 1997	New England Power	Rhode Island	PUC Staff	Divestiture Plan
183.	96-336-TP-CSS June 1997	Ameritech Ohio	Ohio	MCI	Access Charge reform Economic impacts
184.	WR97010052 July 1997	Maxim Sewerage Corp.	New Jersey	Ratepayer Advocate	Rate of Return
185.	97-300 August 1997	LG&E/KU	Kentucky	Attorney General	Merger Plan
186.	Case No. 8738 August 1997	Generic (oral testimony only)	Maryland	Dept. of Natural Resources	Electric Restructuring Policy
187.	Docket No. 2592 September 1997	Eastern Utilities	Rhode Island	PUC Staff	Generation Divestiture
188.	Case No.97-247 September 1997	Cincinnati Bell Telephone	Kentucky	MCI	Financial Condition
189.	Docket No. U-20925 November 1997	Entergy Louisiana	Louisiana	PSC Staff	Rate of Return
190.	Docket No. D97.7.90 November 1997	Montana Power Co.	Montana	Montana Consumers Counsel	Stranded Cost
191.	Docket No. EO97070459 November 1997	Jersey Central Power & Light Co.	New Jersey	Ratepayer Advocate	Stranded Cost
192.	Docket No. R-00974104 November 1997	Duquesne Light Co.	Pennsylvania	Office of Consumer Advocate	Stranded Cost
193.	Docket No. R-00973981 November 1997	West Penn Power Co.	Pennsylvania	Office of Consumer Advocate	Stranded Cost
194.	Docket No. A-1101150F0015 November 1997	Allegheny Power System DQE, Inc.	Pennsylvania	Office of Consumer Advocate	Merger Issues

Expert Testimony
of Matthew I. Kahal

	<u>Docket Number</u>	<u>Utility</u>	<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Client</u>	<u>Subject</u>
195.	Docket No. WR97080615 January 1998	Consumers NJ Water Company	New Jersey	Ratepayer Advocate	Rate of Return
196.	Docket No. R-00974149 January 1998	Pennsylvania Power Company	Pennsylvania	Office of Consumer Advocate	Stranded Cost
197.	Case No. 8774 January 1998	Allegheny Power System DQE, Inc.	Maryland	Dept. of Natural Resources MD Energy Administration	Merger Issues
198.	Docket No. U-20925 (SC) March 1998	Entergy Louisiana, Inc.	Louisiana	Commission Staff	Restructuring, Stranded Costs, Market Prices
199.	Docket No. U-22092 (SC) March 1998	Entergy Gulf States, Inc.	Louisiana	Commission Staff	Restructuring, Stranded Costs, Market Prices
200.	Docket Nos. U-22092 (SC) and U-20925(SC) May 1998	Entergy Gulf States and Entergy Louisiana	Louisiana	Commission Staff	Standby Rates
201.	Docket No. WR98010015 May 1998	NJ American Water Co.	New Jersey	Ratepayer Advocate	Rate of Return
202.	Case No. 8794 December 1998	Baltimore Gas & Electric Co.	Maryland	MD Energy Admin./Dept. Of Natural Resources	Stranded Cost/ Transition Plan
203.	Case No. 8795 December 1998	Delmarva Power & Light Co.	Maryland	MD Energy Admin./Dept. Of Natural Resources	Stranded Cost/ Transition Plan
204.	Case No. 8797 January 1998	Potomac Edison Co.	Maryland	MD Energy Admin./Dept. Of Natural Resources	Stranded Cost/ Transition Plan
205.	Docket No. WR98090795 March 1999	Middlesex Water Co.	New Jersey	Ratepayer Advocate	Rate of Return
206.	Docket No. 99-02-05 April 1999	Connecticut Light & Power	Connecticut	Attorney General	Stranded Costs
207.	Docket No. 99-03-04 May 1999	United Illuminating Company	Connecticut	Attorney General	Stranded Costs
208.	Docket No. U-20925 (FRP) June 1999	Entergy Louisiana, Inc.	Louisiana	Staff	Capital Structure

Expert Testimony
of Matthew I. Kahal

	<u>Docket Number</u>	<u>Utility</u>	<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Client</u>	<u>Subject</u>
209.	Docket No. EC-98-40-000 et. al. May 1999	American Electric Power/ Central & Southwest	FERC	Arkansas PSC	Market Power Mitigation
210.	Docket No. 99-03-35 July 1999	United Illuminating Company	Connecticut	Attorney General	Restructuring
211.	Docket No. 99-03-36 July 1999	Connecticut Light & Power Co.	Connecticut	Attorney General	Restructuring
212.	WR99040249 Oct. 1999	Environmental Disposal Corp.	New Jersey	Ratepayer Advocate	Rate of Return
213.	2930 Nov. 1999	NEES/EUA	Rhode Island	Division Staff	Merger/Cost of Capital
214.	DE99-099 Nov. 1999	Public Service New Hampshire	New Hampshire	Consumer Advocate	Cost of Capital Issues
215.	00-01-11 Feb. 2000	Con Ed/NU	Connecticut	Attorney General	Merger Issues
216.	Case No. 8821 May 2000	Reliant/ODEC	Maryland	Dept. of Natural Resources	Need for Power/Plant Operations
217.	Case No. 8738 July 2000	Generic	Maryland	Dept. of Natural Resources	DSM Funding
218.	Case No. U-23356 June 2000	Entergy Louisiana, Inc.	Louisiana	PSC Staff	Fuel Prudence Issues Purchased Power
219.	Case No. 21453 <u>et. al</u> July 2000	SWEPCO	Louisiana	PSC Staff	Stranded Costs
220.	Case No. 20925 (B) July 2000	Entergy Louisiana	Louisiana	PSC Staff	Purchase Power Contracts
221.	Case No. 24889 August 2000	Entergy Louisiana	Louisiana	PSC Staff	Purchase Power Contracts
222.	Case No. 21453 <u>et. al.</u> February 2001	CLECO	Louisiana	PSC Staff	Stranded Costs

Expert Testimony
of Matthew I. Kahal

	<u>Docket Number</u>	<u>Utility</u>	<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Client</u>	<u>Subject</u>
223.	P-00001860 and P-0000181 March 2001	GPU Companies	Pennsylvania	Office of Consumer Advocate	Rate of Return
224.	CVOL-0505662-S March 2001	ConEd/NU	Connecticut Superior Court	Attorney General	Merger (Affidavit)
225.	U-20925 (SC) March 2001	Entergy Louisiana	Louisiana	PSC Staff	Stranded Costs
226.	U-22092 (SC) March 2001	Entergy Gulf States	Louisiana	PSC Staff	Stranded Costs
227.	U-25533 May 2001	Entergy Louisiana/ Gulf States	Louisiana Interruptible Service	PSC Staff	Purchase Power
228.	P-00011872 May 2001	Pike County Pike	Pennsylvania	Office of Consumer Advocate	Rate of Return
229.	8893 July 2001	Baltimore Gas & Electric Co.	Maryland	MD Energy Administration	Corporate Restructuring
230.	8890 September 2001	Potomac Electric/Conectiv	Maryland	MD Energy Administration	Merger Issues
231.	U-25533 August 2001	Entergy Louisiana / Gulf States	Louisiana	Staff	Purchase Power Contracts
232.	U-25965 November 2001	Generic	Louisiana	Staff	RTO Issues
233.	3401 March 2002	New England Gas Co.	Rhode Island	Division of Public Utilities	Rate of Return
234.	99-833-MJR April 2002	Illinois Power Co.	U.S. District Court	U.S. Department of Justice	New Source Review
235.	U-25533 March 2002	Entergy Louisiana/ Gulf States	Louisiana	PSC Staff	Nuclear Uprates Purchase Power
236.	P-00011872 May 2002	Pike County Power & Light	Pennsylvania	Consumer Advocate	POLR Service Costs

Expert Testimony
of Matthew I. Kahal

	<u>Docket Number</u>	<u>Utility</u>	<u>Jurisdiction</u>	<u>Client</u>	<u>Subject</u>
237.	U-26361, Phase I May 2002	Entergy Louisiana/ Gulf States	Louisiana	PSC Staff	Purchase Power Cost Allocations
238.	R-00016849C001 et al. June 2002	Generic	Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania OCA	Rate of Return
239.	U-26361, Phase II July 2002	Entergy Louisiana/ Entergy Gulf States	Louisiana	PSC Staff	Purchase Power Contracts
240.	U-20925(B) August 2002	Entergy Louisiana	Louisiana	PSC Staff	Tax Issues
241.	U-26531 October 2002	SWEPCO	Louisiana	PSC Staff	Purchase Power Contract
242.	8936 October 2002	Delmarva Power & Lt.	Maryland	Energy Administration Dept. Natural Resources	Standard Offer Service
243.	U-25965 November 2002	SWEPCO/AEP	Louisiana	PSC Staff	RTO Cost/Benefit
244.	8908 November 2002	Generic	Maryland	Energy Administration Dept. Natural Resources	Standard Offer Service
245.	02S-315EG November 2002	Public Service Co. of Colorado	Colorado	Fed. Executive Agencies	Rate of Return
246.	EL02-111-000 December	PJM/MISO	FERC	MD PSC	Transmission Ratemaking